

of the best and most honorable citizens of Louisville; that Louisville was their home; that their property and interests were located in that city, and they were as much bound by ties of affection to the people and best interests of the city as any of its residents. They were used only as a police force. Our "friends the enemy" would have you believe that the Governor of the Commonwealth was a military tyrant. They seem to forget that while the Governor is commander-in-chief of the State forces, and may be ordered by the Legislature in time of war to assume active command in the field, that he is at all times the Chief Magistrate, the chief peace officer of the State, charged with the constitutional duty of seeing that the laws are executed, and for such purpose may employ the military. They condemn the Governor severely in this case because he assumed personal command and did not turn over the troops to the local peace officers, notwithstanding affidavits had been filed before him by a number of reputable Democratic citizens that the local peace officers could not be trusted. Sixty per cent of these State Guards were soldiers who had gone from Louisville into the army during the war with Spain and who on their return were given the grandest reception and ovation the city ever gave.

They forget that the statute is not mandatory; that it does not declare that the Governor SHALL place the militia in the hands of certain local authorities, but declares that he MAY do it, leaving the matter entirely in his discretion. It would be a remarkable statute, which in the teeth of the constitution, should provide that the chief peace officer of the Commonwealth, however unfit by reason of local passion or prejudice the local authorities might be, should be compelled to place troops in their charge. There have been instances in this State which demonstrate that the peace officers of localities may themselves be engaged in strife with others, and that to turn over soldiers to them would result only in enabling them to crush their enemies rather than maintain the peace. To say that the Governor may only call the militia into action to turn them over to others, would be to say that he may direct others to do a thing which he cannot do himself.

MAKES A DIFFERENCE WHOSE ON IS GORED.

And here I may digress for a moment to say that no fault was found with the Governor for placing troops in the army on election day to prevent riot at the request of a Democratic Colonel of the State Guard in 1897. There was no fault found with Gov. McCreary, after Mayor Jacob called out the troops, for going to Louisville, as he is reported in the Courier-Journal as saying, for the purpose of ordering them out of the service in defiance of the local authority; or Gov. Brown, who, being unwilling to risk the local authorities, went to Louisville to take charge of the soldiers to prevent a prize fight. It is all right for Democratic Governors to ignore the local authorities and take command of soldiers, but it is all wrong for a Republican Governor. It is even all right for a Democratic Governor, at the instance of a Democratic commander, to place troops in the army on election day, but all wrong to place them under command of a Republican officer on election day.

But it is also complained that the State Guard of Louisville was improperly created by the Governor. That a Governor cannot have a company mustered into the service unless the County Judge should certify to him his consent and endorsement. In other words, the County Judge is the superior of the Governor and the citizen must look to him for protection rather than the Chief Executive of the State. Under the law the Governor may on his own motion muster State Guards into the service in a city, or the County Judge may recommend such a step and the Governor comply with his request.

You have been told that immediately before the election an army was rented in Louisville and rifles, ammunition and terrible Gatling guns were shipped there for the purpose of carrying the election for the Republicans. There never was a more infamous falsehood uttered.

You are aware of the fact that when troops were needed for the Spanish war Kentucky was called upon for three regiments of Infantry. There were only three regiments in the State Guards and the President under authority of Congress directed that State Guard regiments should be given the preference. None of the regiments were full, but each one volunteered and was recruited to its full capacity. The consequence was that the State Guard was destroyed for the time. Knowing from the past history of the State that at any time soldiers might be needed to maintain the peace and that they had been organized and maintained for many years as a necessary adjunct to the police force, the Governor immediately went to work to supply their places, and knowing that this city was more liable to riot than other portions of the State, organized the first company in Louisville. This company was refused the use of the army by order of the colonel of the First Kentucky and Judge Gregory, who claimed to have control over it, and the Governor concluded, as the local authorities did not desire State Guards, that he would muster out the company, which he did. Companies were formed at Lexington, Pewee Valley, Bowling Green and Frankfort. He did all in his power to organize and equip the State Guard as rapidly as possible, but there was much annoyance and delay in obtaining from the Government guns and other equipments to replace those carried into the army. The Board of Trade of Louisville, feeling the necessity for State Guards in this city, went to work to obtain an armory, in which they were foiled for quite awhile by the local authorities. However, the new regiment was mustered in, in August, and from time to time its officers insisted on equipment. Every effort was made to equip it and other companies of the Second and Third Regiment, which had been formed in different portions of the State. The equipment did not arrive until a short time before the election, when it was promptly forwarded. The Gatling guns, of which complaint is so often made, were the same that belonged to the old organization in Louisville and which had been removed to the State arsenal after the Legion had gone into the army. When the army was obtained they were returned to the place they belonged, which could not have been done until that time, as there was no place to store them.

GREAT FEAR OF A RIOT.

It has always been customary to equip the guard with necessary ammunition. After the old First Regiment had volunteered a large amount of ammunition in the army was removed to Frankfort. The Governor went to Louisville by invitation to speak on Saturday night before the election, expecting to go from there home on the following day, or to another point to speak on Monday if found necessary by the committee. He failed on Sunday to make the necessary connection and was detained in the city. Meanwhile, he was asked to remain over and speak on Monday night at the Auditorium, which he agreed to do if he could be provided transportation in time to reach home on Tuesday to vote, which was arranged. Great excitement developed in the city hourly. The Mayor had issued a proclamation which was interpreted by many as being a menace rather than an effort to keep the peace. On Monday the Democratic commissioners removed some seventy or more election officers, who had been agreed upon by the Republicans, and appointed others in their places, who, it was claimed by the Republicans, were not of their faith, and would cooperate with the Goebel Democrats in preventing a fair election. This produced the most intense excitement. In the hearing of the Governor a number of the leading men of the city declared that it was necessary for them to go to the polls armed in order to preserve their suffrages, and that they intended to do so. Affidavits were filed stating that the local peace officers were in a conspiracy to prevent a fair election and that, owing to the state of public mind, riot and bloodshed was imminent. Infamously articles had appeared in the newspapers. In view of these facts I remained over, declining to speak, and ordered the regiment, which I think numbered only about 200, into the armory for the purpose of keeping the peace, giving them the strictest instructions. They were allowed to go in squads without uniforms and votes; they did not go in uniforms or with guns in sight of a polling place in the city during the time the election was being held. They did not go out of the armory in uniforms except to go to a hotel and get their meals. During the day I was appealed for troops to go to several polling places to make the Goebel Democrats cease their dilatory tactics and frauds by which they were preventing many persons from voting, and in other respects to take part in the election. This I refused most positively to do, saying I was there only to preserve the peace if necessary.

After the polls had closed, a communication was sent to me by Judge Toney, saying he had issued an order to admit inspectors to witness the count, which was being ignored and which he was powerless to enforce. The State Guards were then ordered to proceed to assist in the enforcement of the Judge's order. The voting was concluded at 4 o'clock. The guards did not leave the armory until after 7 o'clock p. m., at which time many of the polling places had been abandoned because the count had been completed. They did not place a single man in or take a single man from any voting booth in the city.

The next morning the Courier-Journal published a factious article showing how they had "marched up the hill and down again," doing absolutely nothing. But after it was found to be certain that the Republicans had been elected, the Democratic politicians and newspapers of Louisville awoke to a realization of the fact that the conduct of the soldiers had been alarming, in consequence of which ten thousand Democrats had remained away from the polls.

It was stated by the Contest Board in their opinion that 8,600 Democrats, who would have voted for Mr. Goebel, were prevented from voting because they say that of the total registered vote of 35,700 22,000 were registered as Democrats and 13,700 as Republicans, and Mr. Goebel received only 13,400 votes, while Taylor received 16,555 votes. Therefore, the Republicans gained 2,855 votes over the number registered and the Democrats lost 8,600 of the number registered, and that all those who did not vote were Democrats, and would have voted for Mr. Goebel.

If Taylor had received no Democratic votes, and the entire Democratic vote had been for Goebel, there might be some force in the statement of the Commissioners; but when it is known that thousands of Democrats voted for Taylor and Brown, their statement is valueless.

When a voter casts his ballot he registers his name on the registered voters list as voting, but it does not appear how he votes. The proof before the Legislative committee, which was not even attempted to be contradicted, showed that of the Louisville registered vote (with the exception of some precincts in which the registration books could not be found) there were 26,610 Democrats, and of these 17,148 voted, or more than 83 per cent, while in the same localities 12,501 Republicans registered, of whom 10,019 voted, being a little more than 80 per cent. The percentage of loss in the Republican vote was thus shown to be greater than the percentage of Democratic loss. It was therefore plainly demonstrated, that thousands of Democrats voted for Taylor and Brown and that the percentage of Republicans failing to vote was greater than that of the Democrats failing to vote. Besides, it must not be forgotten that the Courier-Journal openly charged that there was a large number of Democratic political murderers and murderers in the city working for the Republicans. It was claimed with confidence before the election that the Republicans would carry the city by from twelve to fifteen thousand plurality.

BENNETT H. YOUNG TOUCHED UP.

I have noticed lately a published speech of one Lieut. Capt. Col. Young, of this city, in which he speaks in contemptuous terms of my courage as manifested while Governor and my performance as a warrior in calling out the State Guard at Louisville. No wonder it is that one who has such a splendid record as a warrior should look with contempt upon lesser lights. Not only is he a bloody but also a financial warrior. The charge of Balaklava pales into insignificance when compared with that upon the bank at St. Albans. This is not the first time that a warrior has removed his boots and said:

"Who'er shall dare these boots displace
Shall meet Bombastes face to face."

But he says, that I made direful threats on that occasion and made war upon the women and children of the city of Louisville. To this splendid audience of ladies and gentlemen I will propound a question and I will thank you to answer me or no. Is this statement true? With 4,000 witnesses of the best people in his home city in my favor further response seems unnecessary.

But again, he says, that Governor Bradley issued an order for the troops to break into the booths and capture ballot boxes and arrest election officers. Warrior Young knew this to be untrue. He knew that the only order given was to execute the orders of a Democratic Judge of high character, who refused to lead himself to the dishonorable practices favored by others, and the latchet of whose shoes Warrior Young is not worthy to unlatch.

But no one should think strange of the incorrect statements of Warrior Young. He is so constituted that he cannot correctly think and talk simultaneously. There was once a little steamer with a small boiler and a large whistle. When the whistle blew the boat stood still, for there was not enough steam to run the whistle and the boat at the same time. So with Warrior Young, when he talks he is unable to think; when he thinks he is unable to talk; for he has not the mental calibre to do both at the same time. This being true, he should be pitied rather than blamed.

We have been told by various Democratic speakers that troops may not be used on election day for any purpose, but Judge Cooley in his constitutional law lays down the rule, that they may be used on such occasions when it is shown that the ordinary peace force is insufficient to prevent threatened disorders. Star page 615. In this case it was shown that the police force could not be relied on for any purpose.

Now let it be borne in mind that the examination of witnesses on the trial of the contest failed to show a single man of the 8,600 Democrats who it was claimed were so alarmed by the State Guard that they failed to vote. With all the energy and activity of the attorneys for the contestants, assisted by the police, not one such man could be found. In the face of all these facts the entire vote of the city of Louisville, Republicans and Democrats, was excluded from the count.

DISFRANCHISED MOUNTAIN COUNTIES.

Now, as to the counties of Martin, Johnson and Magoffin. The statements of witnesses was contradictory as to whether or not the vote could be determined from the outside of the ballot, but there was not a single voter produced who stated that he was deterred from voting on account of the ballot, not one that a single vote was lost or gained by either party by reason of the ballot, or that fraud was resorted to in any way; and the proof showed conclusively and without question that the vote cast in those counties was substantially the same as that cast in the preceding three or four elections. In other words, the ballots had no effect whatever on the election and no candidate was prejudiced in the slightest degree. Ballots similar to those used in the three Republican counties were shown to have been used in Graves, McCracken, Powell, Breathitt, Wolfe, Knott, Bracken and perhaps other Democratic counties, the proof being conflicting as to whether or not the vote could be seen from the back, but the votes in all of these counties were counted, while those in the three Republican counties were excluded. It was all wrong for Republican counties to use this ballot, but all right for Democratic counties to use them. So it was that every voter in three Republican counties, Democrat and Republican, was disfranchised. A State ticket defeated by the votes in these localities and Louisville has been declared elected, and today these people can truthfully say they had no voice in that election. Mr. Beckham is not your Governor, for you were deprived of the right to vote. And the greatest outrage of all is that Warrior Young was deprived of his priceless privilege. How it can be possible for a Governor to be elected in this State without his potent aid will remain a secret for all time.

LOUISVILLE DISFRANCHISED.

You pay in this city one-fifth of all the taxes of the State, and are the State's metropolis, yet you had no more voice than the Tagalogs in the Philippines, and thus you are taxed without representation and governed without your consent. The same is true of the three mountain counties. It is true the constitution says elections shall be held by secret ballot. It is true the statute requires that ballots shall be printed on plain, white paper sufficiently thick that the printing can not be distinguished from the back; but the same statute says that the intention of the voter shall be carried out, and up to the decision of Nall vs. Tinsley it has been uniformly held that the requirements of the election law were almost universally directory, and that when no fraud or error was shown the vote should be counted.

But admitting, for the sake of argument, that it was proper to throw out all those votes numbering more than 42,000 and constituting one-tenth of the entire vote of the State. What was the remedy? Was it right to disfranchise one-tenth of the State when the constitution requires that the Governor shall be elected by the VOTERS OF THE STATE? Suppose this ballots were used in the three counties, was that the fault of the voter? Were not the ballots furnished by the officials of the State? Is it not true that the voter was compelled to use these ballots or lose his vote? And even were it true that the Governor of the State interfered with the

military and prevented a fair election, was not that the act of an officer of the State for which the voter was not responsible, and should those who were prevented from voting thereby be disfranchised? Let Mr. Cooley, the most eminent authority on constitutional law in this country, answer the question. At star page 616 he says: "If any action was required of the authorities preliminary to the election and that which was taken was not such as to give all the electors opportunity to participate and no mode was open to the electors by which the officers might be compelled to act, it would seem that such neglect, constituting as it would the disfranchisement of the excluded electors, must on general principles render the whole election nugatory, for that can not be called an election or the expression of the popular sentiment when a part of the electors have been allowed to be heard and the others, without being guilty of fraud or negligence, have been excluded."

Again at star page 621 he says: "Or if by riots or otherwise legal voters are intimidated and prevented from voting, . . . the election should be set aside altogether as having failed in the purpose for which it was called." To the same effect is the decision of the Kentucky Court of Appeals in Pendleton vs. Hocker, 100 Ky. 726, and various decisions cited by Judge Cooley.

So, even if the charges relied on were true the only honest action that could have been taken was to order another election and allow the voters of the whole State to select their rulers.

CONTEST COMMITTEES PACKED.

When the committees were selected to try the contests the two houses had 128 members; of these 53 were Republicans and 10 anti-Goebel Democrats, making 63, and 75 Goebel Democrats, a difference of only 12. Yet when the committees were drawn ten Goebel Democrats and one Republican constituted the Governor's committee and nine Goebel Democrats and two Republicans constituted the Lieutenant Governor's committee. In other words, on the two committees were nineteen Democrats and three Republicans. Mr. McQuown in a recent speech undertook to excuse this by referring to the uncertainty of drawing and instanced the committee in the Lewis-McChord contest in the Constitutional Convention. He stated that there were 86 Democrats and 14 Republicans in that convention, and yet the committee was about equally divided. Mr. McQuown is mistaken. There were 82 Democrats and 18 Republicans in that body, and the committee was composed of 3 Republicans and 6 Democrats. I will not go into a discussion of how these committees were drawn, as that has been fully explained by many others and is understood by the people generally. Suffice it to say, it was difficult to find Republican names in the box and easy to find Democrats. I do not charge that it was fraudulently done, rather should I think it was done by mere slight-of-hand, which at least commends itself for remarkable adroitness. These committees made reports without giving any facts upon which they were based, and the Legislature proceeded to vote at once without argument or reading one line of the more than 1,700 pages of typewritten testimony. In the trial of all cases the evidence is read in order that the judge may know what are the facts, or at least may make a show of fairness, but no such step was deemed necessary here. They knew that Goebel was a Democrat and Taylor was a Republican, and this was amply sufficient. You all know that there was but one election held in your city in November last, and that on that day State officers and members of the Legislature were elected. But these conscientious Democratic statesmen in the House, although deciding that no election was held for State officers, on account of intimidation, and on that account disfranchising all your people, during the same session decided that there was an election for the Legislature and disfranchised only a sufficient number of Republicans to rob two Republican members of their places and give them to Democrats. In other words, the Democrats were so badly scared that their failure to vote in the Governor's race rendered the election void, while in the other races they were only scared enough to authorize the seating of Democrats as legislators who had been repudiated by the voters of this city. So it turns out that you had an election for members of the Legislature, but none for Governor. Again soldiers were called out in Covington on the day of the election to assist in the service of process, but Mr. Goebel having obtained a majority of 2,000 in that city no complaint was made. It was all right to have soldiers in Covington, but all wrong to have them in Louisville. In the trial of these contests rules of evidence were violated, sufficient time refused contestants to introduce their testimony, and more than one thousand witnesses not allowed to testify. Truly, this was a wonderful trial, and will go down in history as "one among ten thousand and altogether lovely." But we are told that all this conduct was endorsed by the courts. I deny that one line of justification or endorsement can be found in any decision that was rendered.

It was alleged in Taylor's petition that he had received the greatest number of votes cast in the race for Governor; that the committee was fraudulently drawn; that he was not allowed to introduce his testimony; that many members of the committee were partial and some of them interested; that no argument was allowed him; that the evidence was not read, etc., etc. These allegations were not met by a denial and a trial had on the merits, in order that the truth might be manifested; but a demurrer was interposed and on that alone the case was heard. The legal effect of that demurrer was that even if all these charges were true, the General Assembly had complete and final power over the subject and its action could not be reviewed by the courts.

NO COURT HAS EVER DECLARED GOEBEL ELECTED.

Judge Field, the Kentucky Court of Appeals, except Judge DuRelle, and a majority of the Supreme Court decided that the demurrer was well taken. No court held from the evidence that Mr. Goebel was elected. No court decided that the committee was not fraudulent. No court decided that a fair trial had been given or that the contest was for contestants on its merits. The only decision was that the action of the General Assembly was final and supreme.

But they seek to excuse themselves by saying that they have in all things resorted to the "forms of law." This we have seen in every Democratic newspaper and heard from every Democratic stump. On this statement all stand agreed. They did resort to the "FORMS of law"—forms without spirit, shadows without substance—forms which prevented an exposure of their rottenness, and which concealed the true merits of their case. The Savior of Mankind was tried under the "forms of law," but that fact, instead of justifying his crucifixion, rendered his accusers infamous for all time.

But in response to all charges, Democratic orators have one answer. They point to the assassination of Mr. Goebel and, holding up his blood-stained garments, conjure the multitude to condone their crime of grand larceny. No man condemns that assassination more than I. No man loaths more the cowardly outrage. The man or men who are guilty deserve the most condign punishment. Between Mr. Goebel and myself there was no bitterness. Our personal relations were of the most agreeable character. I do not hesitate to say that he was a man of fixed convictions, reckless courage and a high order of intellect. He was in truth incomparably superior in every way to those who surrounded and advised him.

During his campaign he said that he would not, if elected, sign any act which repealed the election law, but justified it on every stump. But now that he is dead, and a Legislature in session, called for the express purpose of amending and altering that law, his pretended friends, who are preparing to erect a monument to his memory, should place upon it this inscription: "We endorsed him while living, but now that he is gone, and can be of no further service to us, we will repeal or substantially change the law that bears his name, not because we love him less, but because we love 'ourselves' more."

was for contestants on its merits. The only decision was that the action of the General Assembly was final and supreme.

But they seek to excuse themselves by saying that they have in all things resorted to the "forms of law." This we have seen in every Democratic newspaper and heard from every Democratic stump. On this statement all stand agreed. They did resort to the "FORMS of law"—forms without spirit, shadows without substance—forms which prevented an exposure of their rottenness, and which concealed the true merits of their case. The Savior of Mankind was tried under the "forms of law," but that fact, instead of justifying his crucifixion, rendered his accusers infamous for all time.

But in response to all charges, Democratic orators have one answer. They point to the assassination of Mr. Goebel and, holding up his blood-stained garments, conjure the multitude to condone their crime of grand larceny. No man condemns that assassination more than I. No man loaths more the cowardly outrage. The man or men who are guilty deserve the most condign punishment. Between Mr. Goebel and myself there was no bitterness. Our personal relations were of the most agreeable character. I do not hesitate to say that he was a man of fixed convictions, reckless courage and a high order of intellect. He was in truth incomparably superior in every way to those who surrounded and advised him.

During his campaign he said that he would not, if elected, sign any act which repealed the election law, but justified it on every stump. But now that he is dead, and a Legislature in session, called for the express purpose of amending and altering that law, his pretended friends, who are preparing to erect a monument to his memory, should place upon it this inscription: "We endorsed him while living, but now that he is gone, and can be of no further service to us, we will repeal or substantially change the law that bears his name, not because we love him less, but because we love 'ourselves' more."

RETURN THE STOLEN OFFICES.

If this is a good law, as stated by Mr. Beckham in his message, why expend \$100,000 for a special session to amend or change its provisions. Is it right that the people should be taxed this large sum simply because some one is not satisfied with its provisions. No. My friends, this was not the reason for the special session. The courts had said that the only appeal from the action of the last Legislature was to the people. That appeal was being made. The conspirators who procured the passage of this law saw the people, who had been outraged and disfranchised, were arising in their might to condemn them at the polls. The clouds were gathering in the political horizon, the mutterings of indignation were heard like the rolling of distant thunder, the lightning of the people's justice was about to descend when Mr. Beckham and his advisers sought shelter in the legislative halls and undertook to abate the fury by altering the instrument that brought so much trouble and disgrace on the Commonwealth. But if the law was wrong, if indeed forgiveness was being sought, why not first surrender the stolen goods. But this they will never do. They are like the man who stole a horse and went to the deacons of the church and besought them to pray God to forgive him. Said one of them: "Before you can hope for forgiveness you must return the property." "Oh, well," he replied, "I don't want to do that; what I want is to be forgiven and allowed to keep the horse."

Now, my friends, in view of the facts as they exist, who is responsible for the condition of things? Who is responsible for the foul assassination of Mr. Goebel, who I have been credibly informed declined to make the contest, and by an accident was prevented from going West and was on the next day finally persuaded to change his mind?

From 1895 to this time the leaders of what is called the Beckham wing of the Democratic party have been guilty of the perpetration of a long line of unlawful acts. They have defied public opinion; they have attempted to brow beat and terrify the members of the General Assembly; they have catered to the spirit of the mob; they have disregarded the constitution and trampled it under their unhallowed feet; they have disfranchised the people; they have stolen the offices which the people decreed should go to others. If it be true, as contended by them, that Mr. Goebel was killed by Republicans who were incensed against him on account of the contest, which his advisers induced him to make against his will, then their long line of unlawful conduct their robbery of fellow-citizens, their trampling upon the expressed will of the people, their frauds and wrongs committed "under the forms of law" were the causes which lead to the taking of human life, and the blood of Mr. Goebel is upon their hands. They should be indicted and convicted by public opinion, along with the murderer.

They ask you to come and stand beside the grave of their martyred leader and swear eternal hate to the Republican party, which they say caused his assassination. I deny that the Republican party is guilty of this foul crime and, with the Courier-Journal, say that those who committed the act are alone responsible.

But I will ask you to come with me while I show you more than 42,000 disfranchised citizens of this Commonwealth—men whom all require to constitute true manhood, are equal to any who ever lived, men who are governed without their consent, men who are taxed without representation, men who are political slaves. Come with me and let me show you the foul blot upon the escutcheon of our fair State which was placed there by designing men who in their greed for office have not only forgotten their duty to their fellow men, but their duty to their proud old Commonwealth.

LIBERTY'S BLEEDING FORM.

Come and let me show you the bleeding form of liberty, stabbed almost unto death by the polished blades of treason in the hands of those whom she had cherished and protected. Come! Come! and assist in binding her wounds and raising her prostrate form from the dust, and in November next place her upon the throne that she

did erst adorn, that the people of all parties may once more kneel and worship her.

I do not charge that the Democratic party is responsible for these outrages. In it are thousands who do not endorse such action. I charge that the conspirators who concocted these miserable schemes and engaged in this continuous violation of law are alone responsible. Mr. Beckham voted for that bill, was a party to all the wrongs committed, and he is its beneficiary. Hence he should and will be condemned by the people of Kentucky.

No man who voted against Mr. Goebel can afford to vote for Mr. Beckham. If he could not vote for Mr. Goebel because of the passage of the bill and the conduct of those who had it in charge before the election in 1899, he surely cannot now vote for Mr. Beckham after the machine has been put in full operation and the disfranchisement of the people accomplished.

NATIONAL ISSUES.

There are important national issues now confronting the people, but important as they are they must, in Kentucky, be subordinated to those which are of such tremendous local importance. Our first duty is to break the shackles that bind us, so that we may exercise the most sacred right of freemen—the right to vote and have that vote counted. But I cannot refrain from contrasting the last four years of Democratic rule with the administration now drawing to a close. During the former period, property of every description materially declined in value, interest was high, money was hoarded, 47 per cent of the wage workers were idle, compared with which the present strikes are as the mole hill to the mountain. Manufactures were closed, so much so that there was but one great prevailing, absorbing trust necessitated and that was the "American Soup Trust." During that time individuals, banks, railroads—indeed, every character of business was more or less plunged into bankruptcy; mortgages were being steadily multiplied, we were constantly increasing our National debt and were unable to liquidate our indebtedness to foreign countries. In the midst of this fearful condition, the stoutest hearts almost failed. We were then told by Mr. Bryan that the cause of all this trouble was the demonization of silver, that the amount of money in circulation would decrease, that when silver went down every product of the farmer would follow, and that the only salvation was its restoration. We were told by him that gold was a coward and it was about to come upon the nation it would skulk and hide, favoring us in commercial disaster.

But we have lived to see all these prophecies fail. The gold standard has become firmly fixed, prosperity has attended every business department. War has visited us, but notwithstanding all this the Spaniards have been driven from Cuba, the glory of America's arms has been manifested on land and sea, from Cuba to the Forbidden City of the Chinese Empire, and America has shown herself the first nation of the world. Horses, cattle, pigs, sheep and every product of the farm has increased in value, in many instances more than doubled. Railroads have gone out of the hands of receivers, mortgages have been cancelled, manufacturing has been resumed, new plants erected and new interests developed; the dreams of 10-cent cotton have been realized; wages have been increased from 10 to 20 per cent in nearly every industry, amounting last year to \$765,000,000 more than in 1896; surplus instead of deficits are now shown in our revenues; our excess of exports over imports is more than three times as great as under Democratic rule; money may be borrowed in New York for 2½ per cent interest and every cloud that overhung us then has vanished before the blazing sun of Republican prosperity.

FREE SILVER IS AN ISSUE.

But it is said by some that free silver is no longer an issue. If this be true, then it has been demonstrated beyond all doubt that Mr. Bryan is neither doctor nor diagnostician, that his judgment was wholly at fault in 1896, and if he could not be trusted then he cannot be trusted now. But it is the issue. Mr. Bryan, like Ephraim, is joined to his idols, and in his letter of acceptance in speaking of the Democratic platform says:

"In order that there may be no uncertainty as to the method of restoring bimetalism, the specific declaration in favor of free and unlimited coinage at the existing ratio of 16 to 1, independent of other nations, is repeated. The Democratic party remains a steadfast advocate of the gold and silver coinage of the constitution and it is not willing that other nations shall determine for us the time and manner of restoring silver to its ancient place as standard money. . . . Whether the Senate, now hostile to bimetalism, can be changed during this campaign, or the campaign of 1902, can only be determined after the votes are counted; but neither the present nor the future political complexion of Congress has prevented, or should prevent, an announcement of the parties' position upon the subject in unequivocal terms."

Some of those who support Mr. Bryan, in flat contradiction of his position, say that free silver is not an issue, and even if it were the Republicans are in a majority in the Senate so that he cannot do wrong if he desired, and therefore they will support him. Whenever men vote for a candidate because the only hope of safety is in the party they condemn, they exhibit an absence of both intelligence and consistency.

No man can foretell the result of Mr. Bryan's election. He speaks truly when he says the counting of the votes must determine it. If he should succeed in being elected and in carrying with him a majority in Congress, it is more than probable that before his term expires he will have a Democratic Senate. Should this occur he will surely reverse our present financial policy, as he has repeatedly declared he would do. Or if the Republicans should not retain power in both branches to restrain the hand of his Secretary of the Treasury our financial policies will be materially changed.

WHY NOT ELECT MCKINLEY?
Why not elect McKinley and thy cor-